

RE: Additional Data Needed

Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj) to: Brattin, Bill

11/09/2010 12:52 PM

From: "Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)" <HILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>

To:

Cc: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov

We have calculated a CHEEC for all 513 but Bob has been focusing on just the 2004 cohort with usable chest X-rays (n=280) so that's all we've provided to-date.

From: Brattin, Bill [mailto:brattin@srcinc.com]

Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 2:42 PM

To: Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)

Subject: RE: Additional Data Needed

ok, I think I get it.

[I would call but my phone is out]

Do you plan to assign a value for CHEEK to all 513 people, or just to focus on the study participants who were part of the 2004 cohort?

All is better if you can do it.

Bill Brattin

SRC, Inc.

999 18th Street, Suite 1975

Denver CO 80202

brattin@srcinc.com

303-357-3121

From: Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj) [HILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU]

Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 2:14 PM

To: Brattin, Bill

Cc: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov

Subject: RE: Additional Data Needed

The original 1980 study had 513 participants, but only 501 had usable chest X-rays. We have complete work histories for all 513. We just don't know which 12 (513-501) didn't have chest X-rays because we only have X-ray results for about half of them. We do know which of the 501 had positive X-rays.

If this isn't clear, feel free to give me a call...it may be easier to explain over the phone.

Tim

513.558.0228

From: Brattin, Bill [mailto:brattin@srcinc.com]

Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 2:06 PM

To: Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)

Cc: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov

Subject: RE: Additional Data Needed

I guess I do not understand the situation.

If we don't know who they are, does that mean we do not know their work history?

I don't see how we can include 12 people if we do not know their cumulative exposure, even if we are correct in assuming they do not have disease.

Bill Brattin
SRC, Inc.
999 18th Street, Suite 1975
Denver CO 80202
brattin@srcinc.com
303-357-3121

From: Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj) [HILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU]
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 1:33 PM
To: Brattin, Bill
Cc: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: Additional Data Needed

Bill, The difficulty is that we don't know who the 12 are. We only have about half of the original B-reader forms.

Tim

From: Brattin, Bill [mailto:brattin@srcinc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 1:30 PM
To: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov; Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)
Cc: Borton, Eric (bortonek); Lemasters, Grace (lemastgj); Lockey, James (lockeyje); Rice, Carol (ricech)
Subject: RE: Additional Data Needed

The other choice is to exclude the 12 without x-rays.

There is no requirement that the 1984 data and the 2004 data must be paired.

All that is required is that each observation be valid.

Bill Brattin
SRC, Inc.
999 18th Street, Suite 1975
Denver CO 80202
brattin@srcinc.com
303-357-3121

From: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov [Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 1:23 PM
To: Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj); Brattin, Bill
Cc: Borton, Eric (bortonek); Lemasters, Grace (lemastgj); Lockey, James (lockeyje); Rice, Carol (ricech)
Subject: RE: Additional Data Needed

My choice is to assume the 12 without x-rays were negative. I think this will give Bill what he needs to "titrate" the Latency term.

From: "Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)" <HILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>

To: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: "Lockey, James (lockeyje)" <lockeyje@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>, "Lemasters, Grace (lemastgj)" <LEMASTGJ@ucmail.uc.edu>, "Rice, Carol (ricech)" <ricech@ucmail.uc.edu>, "Borton, Eric (bortonek)" <BORTONEK@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>

Date: 11/09/2010 11:15 AM

Subject: RE: Additional Data Needed

Bob, There are two issues with providing you with this information. First, we only have approximately half of the actual B-reader forms from the 1980 study. From the master thesis we know who the 10 people are with pleural changes and the one person with interstitial changes. However, since only 501 of the 513 participants had a usable X-ray, we can't say for sure that the remainder were negative since 12 didn't have a usable 1980 Xray. The second issue is that the ILO B-reader form that was used for the 1980 study is an older version than the one used in 2004 and does not as clearly differentiate between diffuse (pleural thickening that involves CPA blunting) and discrete pleural thickening. Most likely the distribution is as follows: 6 discrete pleural thickening, 3 diffuse pleural thickening, and 1 with both discrete and diffuse. So in summary we can tell you who the one person from 1980 with interstitial changes is, we can tell you who the 10 with pleural changes are and our best estimation if they are discrete or diffuse, and we cannot definitively tell you that the balance of the 513 are all negative because 12 people didn't have films and we don't know who they are.

One possibility in moving forward is for us to assume the 12 without X-rays were negative. Then we could supply you with a spreadsheet as you requested, being fairly certain of its accuracy.

Please let us know

Tim

-----Original Message-----

From: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov [<mailto:Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov>]
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2010 3:45 PM
To: Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)
Cc: brattin@srcinc.com; Jill Lundell
Subject: Additional Data Needed

Our modeling efforts have led us to need the data used in the Lockey et al. (1984) publication.

This is what we need:

ID number (same as that in final UC report)

x-ray date (for the 1984 publication)

Health outcome for each worker in the 1984 publication (comparable to the health outcomes in the final UC report - discrete, diffuse, interstitial)

We can use the Asbestos Other in the final UC report.